arXiv:1407.0450v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 2 Jul 2014

Comment on "Polar and antiferromagnetic order in f=1 boson systems"

C. G. Bao
Center of Theoretical Nuclear Physics, National Laboratory of Heavy Ion Accelerator, Lanzhou, 730000, PRC and State Key Laboratory of Optoelectronic Materials and Technologies School of Physics and Engineering, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, PRC

An inequality for the lower bound of the average number of hyperfine component $\mu = 0$ particles in the ground state of spin-1 condensates under a magnetic field has been derived in ref.[1]. It is shown in this comment that, in a broad domain of parameters usually accessed in experiments, the lower bound appears to be negative. Thus the applicability of the inequality is very limited.

The essential results of Tasaki's letter [1] are concluded in two theorems. In particular, an inequality (eq.(11) of [1]) is derived to constrain the number of spin-component $\mu = 0$ particles in the ground state (g.s.). The inequality has the following short-comings.

(i) Eq.(11)of [1] can be rewritten as

$$\langle \Phi_{GS}, \hat{\rho}_0 \Phi_{GS} \rangle \geq 1 - c_0 \frac{N}{2qV}, \tag{1}$$

where $c_0 = (2g_2 + g_0)/3$ is the strength of the central (spin-independent) force. Thus, this inequality demonstrates that the constraint arises essentially from the central force. This is misleading. Since the spin-flip is caused by the spin-dependent force with the strength $c_2 = (g_2 - g_0)/3$, it should be c_2 to play the essential role.

(ii) There is a great difference between the ground states of Rb ($c_2 < 0$) and Na ($c_2 > 0$) condensates (Say, when $q = 0$, the spins of Rb are coupled to total spin $S = N$, while the spins of Na are coupled to $S = M$, where M is the total magnetization). It has been shown by numerical calculation that the variations of the $\langle \Phi_{GS}, \hat{\rho}_0 \Phi_{GS} \rangle$ versus q of these two species differ from each other greatly (refer to Fig.2b and Fig.3b of [2], where the scales for q are greatly different). Therefore, the constraints for the two species should be greatly different.

(iii) When a magnetic field is applied, the g.s. is not necessary to have $M = 0$ (In fact, the energy of the states with a larger M may be remarkably reduced due to the negative linear Zeeman energy). It has been shown that $\langle \Phi_{GS}, \hat{\rho}_0 \Phi_{GS} \rangle$ in fact depends on M seriously.[2] The inequality in [1] is confined only for the case of $M = 0$. A better constraint should take the $M-$*dependence* into account.

(iv) The constraint given by eq.(11) of [1] is too loose. To evaluate numerically, it is assumed that the Na atoms are trapped by a harmonic potential $U(r) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 r^2$. Then the g.s. of the single-particle hamiltonian is just the lowest harmonic oscillator state. When $\hbar\omega$ and $\sqrt{\hbar/m\omega}$ are used as units for energy and length, according to the definition given in [1], $1/V = (1/\pi)^{3/2}$. When q and c_0 are expressed in the new units, their values are $q = 1745(B/G)^2/(\omega\,\mathrm{sec})$ and $c_0 = 6.77 \times 10^{-4}(\omega\,\mathrm{sec})^{1/2}$, where G is Gauss and B is the magnetic field (B/G and $\omega\,\mathrm{sec}$ are both a number). Accordingly, eq.(11) of [1] becomes

$$\langle \Phi_{GS}, \hat{\rho}_0 \Phi_{GS} \rangle \geq 1 - 3.48 \times 10^{-8} \frac{N(\omega\,\mathrm{sec})^{3/2}}{(B/G)^2} \tag{2}$$

Since N is usually large, the right side might become negative. For an example, if $N = 10^4$ and $\omega = 300\,\mathrm{sec}^{-1}$, the right side becomes $1 - \frac{1.81}{(B/G)^2}$. It implies that, when $B < 1.34G$, the right side is negative. Thus, in a large domain quite often accessed, the inequality makes no sense.

In the derivation of Theorem 2 the contribution from the term $\langle \Phi_{GS}, \hat{V}\Phi_{GS} \rangle$ has been completely neglected. In general, during the derivation of a formula or an inequality, the neglect of a small term is allowed. However, At the present case, $\langle \Phi_{GS}, \hat{V}\Phi_{GS} \rangle$ is not a small term. Instead, it is essential. In order to overcome the above shortcomings, this term should be recovered.

Incidentally, the statement stated in *Theorem 1* is not new. A more general formula for $\langle \vartheta^{[N]}_{SM}, \hat{\rho}_\mu \vartheta^{[N]}_{SM} \rangle$ has been given in Eq.(10) of Ref.[2]. When $\mu = 0$, the general formula can be rewritten as

$$\langle \vartheta^{[N]}_{SM}, \hat{\rho}_0 \vartheta^{[N]}_{SM} \rangle = \frac{S(S+1)(2N+1) - N - M^2(2N+3)}{N(2S+3)(2S-1)}. \tag{3}$$

When $S = M = 0$, the above formula gives $\langle \vartheta^{[N]}_{00}, \hat{\rho}_0 \vartheta^{[N]}_{00} \rangle = 1/3$ as stated in *Theorem 1.*

[1] H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 230402 (2013).
[2] C.G. Bao, J. Phys. A, 45, 235002 (2012).